

Remarks/Arguments:

Claims 1, 3-4, 6, 8-13 and 15 are pending in the above-identified application. Claim 2, 5, 7 and 14 are cancelled.

The Examiner issued an Office Action on August 20, 2008, rejecting claims 1-2 and 4-13 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (e) as being anticipated by Moriyama et al. Applicants filed an Amendment to the Office Action on November 14, 2008, arguing that Moriyama does not disclose or suggest "... said first change-over means changes over so that said wired data communication is performed, and using the wired connection detected by said first detecting means, gives a change-over instruction to said second change-over means to change over." (Amendment, page 11).

The Examiner issued an Advisory Action on December 3, 2008, entering Applicants amendments to the claims, but states that amendments do not place the application in condition for allowance because the claimed term "a change-over instruction" can be interpreted as "... any signal/data/information that indicates the connectivity of a communication line/link/path, thus reflecting whether a change-over means should make the shifting (to either a wired or wireless communication mode). (Advisory Action, page 2).

Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's interpretation of Applicants' claimed "change-over instruction" and submit that Moriyama does not disclose or suggest "... said first change-over means changes over so that said wired data communication is performed, and using the wired connection detected by said first detecting means, gives a change-over instruction to said second change-over means to change over."

It is respectfully submitted, however, that the claims are now patentable over the art of record for the reasons set forth below. Applicants' invention, as recited by claim 1, includes features which is neither disclosed nor suggested by the art of record, namely:

... when said wired connection is being performed, control signals can be exchanged between said first change-over means and said second change-over means ...

... when said first wired connection detecting means detects that said wired connection is being performed, said first change-over means changes over so that said wired data communication is performed, and using **the control signals**, gives a change-over instruction to said second change-over means to change over so that said wired data communication is performed ... (Emphasis added).

Basis for these amendments may be found, for example, at page 20, lines 6-10 and Fig. 1 of the originally filed application.

At page 2, lines 7-14, the Examiner states that Moriヤマ does not disclose "... said first change-over means changes over so that said wired data communication is performed, and using the wired connection detected by said first detecting means, gives a change-over instruction to said second change-over means to change over." In particular, the Examiner cites to paragraph [0079] of Moriヤマ.

Paragraph [0079] of Moriヤマ recites:

The detachment detector 42 can be provided inside the processing apparatus 10, instead of inside the cradle 40. In this case, **the CPU 11 of the processing apparatus 10 need only periodically exchange information with the display device 50, via the wired data transfer line 21**, to determine whether the wired image transfer line 22 is connected, since the exchange of data can at least be confirmed at constant time intervals. (Emphasis added).

Moriヤマ does not, however, disclose or suggest control signals of any kind. Rather, Moriヤマ merely discloses a CPU 11 that periodically exchanges information with the display device 50 via the wired data transfer line. This information exchanged between the CPU 11 and the display device 50, which may be used to determine whether the wired image transfer line 22 is connected, can not be equated with Applicants' claimed "control signals." Thus, claim 1 is allowable over the art of record.

Claims 4, 6 and 8-10, while not identical to claim 1, includes features similar to those set forth above with regard to claim 1. Thus, claims 4, 6 and 8-10 are also allowable over the art of record for reasons similar to those set forth above with regard

to claim 1. Claims 11-13 depend from claims 8-10, respectively. Accordingly, claims 11-13 are allowable over the art of record.

Claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being obvious in view of Moriyama et al. and Fong. Claim 3 is allowable, however, because it depends from allowable claim 1.

Claim 15 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being obvious in view of Moriyama et al. and Lempio et al. Claim 15, while not identical to claim 1, includes features similar to those set forth above with regard to claim 1. As described above, Moriyama et al. does not disclose the features of claim 1, namely, "... when said wired connection is being performed, control signals can be exchanged between said first change-over means and said second change-over means ..." Lempio does not make up for the deficiencies of Moriyama et al., as described above with respect to claim 1. Thus, claim 15 is allowable over the art of record.

In view of the amendments and arguments set forth above, the above-identified application is in condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Allan Ratner, Reg. No. 19,717
Attorney for Applicants

DFD/nm

Dated: December 22, 2008

P.O. Box 980 Valley Forge, PA 19482 (610) 407-0700
--

NM379888